

Appl. No. 10/064,041
Amtd. Dated December 05, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 16, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Objection to the IDS filed on 3/14/2003:

The IDS filed 3/14/2003 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97,
1.98 and MPEP 6069 because the cited reference, Taiwanese Patent No. 341418 has
5 not been provided.

Response:

The applicants have noted this error with the IDS filed on 3/14/2003. A new
IDS will be filed in its place, and the date of resubmission will be considered the
10 date in which the IDS has satisfied the requirements of filing the statement.

2. Rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 101:

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory
subject matter. The claims, as written, are directed to a computer algorithm with is
15 not implemented in the technological arts. The claimed invention is therefore not
concrete or tangible.

Response:

Claims 1-10 have been amended to recite "a method for converting a text file
20 into a circuit design database..." for overcoming this rejection. The method is not
restricted to being performed merely as a computer algorithm, and can be
implemented in numerous forms of tangible items such as a computer memory or a
computer system. Therefore, the amended claims 1-10 should be allowable with
respect to 35 U.S.C. 101. Reconsideration of claims 1-10 is respectfully requested.
25

3. Rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Appl. No. 10/064,041
Amtd. Dated December 05, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 16, 2005

Brodie et al. (US 5,408,667, Brodic).

Response:

5 Brodie states in col. 4, lines 14-19,
“when source code 20 is complete enough to test, it is extracted 24 from unified
design file 12 and used to create a file suited for input to language translator 17.
Language translator 17 compiles 26 the source code into an executable computer
program.”

10 As taught in paragraph [0005] of the present invention,
“the common text 14B is used to record important issues of the circuit design, such
as a special application of a circuit device or an idea of the circuit design.”

Therefore, Brodie teaches compiling the *source code* into an executable
computer program.

15 However, Brodie doesn't teach compiling a hardware description written in the
text file into the corresponding *circuit design*.

20 Brodie states in col. 4, lines 19-29,
“The computer program is then tested 27 to determine if the computer program
functions in accordance with the function specification created earlier. If a deficiency
is found, source code 20 within unified design file 12 is modified 28. Since both
source code 20 and the related documentation both reside in unified design file 12,
appropriate modifications are easily made to the documentation at the same time.
The modified documentation and source code 20 are added to unified design file 12
and marked 23 as before.”

25 As taught in paragraph [0020] of the present invention,
 “[0020] the comment text 30B are first converted into the corresponding code stream
32B according to a predetermined conversion rule.”

Brodie teaches *extracting the source code from the unified design file* and

Appl. No. 10/064,041
Amdt. Dated December 05, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 16, 2005

using the source code to create a file suited for input to language translator 17; Brodie also teaches that *the source code is marked in the unified design file.* Brodie further teaches that if a deficiency is found, source code within unified design file is modified.

5 However, Brodie doesn't teach converting *comment text* written in the text file into a *code stream* according to *a predetermined conversion rule*, as is recited in claim 1.

In summary, extracting, using, marking, and appropriate modifications are needed in Brodie's case. However those are not needed in the present invention.

10

For these reasons, the applicant submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguished from the teachings of the Brodie patent. Claims 2-10 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-10 is respectfully requested.

15

In view of the above statements in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/064,041
Amdt. Dated December 05, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 16, 2005

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: 12/05/2005

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)